DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 443 EA 011 053

AUTHOR Wisniewski, Richard
TITLE The Dean of Education and the Looking-Glass Self.
PUB DATE 2 Mar 77
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Professors of Education (Chicago, Illinois, March 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Deans; College Faculty; Educational Change; Ethnography; Higher Education; *Leadership; *Role Perception; Role Theory; *Schools of Education; Self Evaluation; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

Outlining the premises of role theory applicable to the dean's role, this paper attempts to analyze the dean's role from several perspectives. It recommends ethnographic research for a true understanding of the dean's role and as a means of hastening the reform of education. Recent studies of the deanship, the professoriate, and schools of education reflect the kind of critical self-scrutiny advocated in this paper. The role of the dean of the college of education is analyzed here in relation to the significant others to whom the dean must respond: faculty, students, central administration, school systems, superintendents, and state departments of education. The role of the dean is largely determined by the expectations that others have about it. Faculties expect the dean to be a leader and this is the role toward which the dean must strive. Deans of education must be students of their own roles if they have hopes of becoming true leaders or of influencing institutional change. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Wisniewski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED162443

EA 011 053

THE DEAN OF EDUCATION AND THE LOOKING-GLASS SELF

Richard Wisniewski
College of Education
University of Oklahoma

The dean of education is the subject of this discussion. My goal is threefold: 1) To outline premises of role theory applicable to the decanal role; 2) To suggest the power of ethnographic research for a true understanding of that role; and 3) To argue that such research may hasten the internal reform of education by those of us in the profession if we accept leadership as being integral to our roles as professors or deans.

In a moment I will cite work by scholars in our domain examining the professoriate, deans and schools of education. These studies are a measure of our maturity as a profession. When we can honestly analyze our performance, our characteristics, and all of the expectations laid upon us, we can take an active role in the reform of the institutions of which we are a part. I stress the matter of reform to emphasize my conviction that knowledge about deans and the professoriate is vital if we are to dramatically alter teaching/learning processes at all levels of education. As deans and professors, we can be part of positive solutions if we recognize far more clearly the roles we play in institutions.

An understanding of academic roles does not make one a reformer, and I do not make that naive assumption. Knowledge gleaned on the professoriate and deans will be used for political advantage by those both resisting and pressing for reforms. I will use it to press for reforms. Others will not. We have a better chance of reaching some consensus whatever our leanings if the information we share is based on solid scholarship, and such data is emerging in the work of our colleagues. In seeking additional data, role theory provides a powerful heuristic framework.

Two Basic Premises of Role Theory

The theoretical context of this discussion is based on concepts introduced by two intellectual giants -- C.H. Cooley and George Herbert Mead. Their concepts offer a framework critical to any analysis of institutional roles such as that of professor or dean.

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Professors of Education, Chicago, March 2, 1977. My thanks to Professor Mary Dewey for her critique of this paper.

In Human Nature and the Social Order, C.H. Cooley wrote:

> As we see...our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it.
>
> A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. The comparison with a looking-glass hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential.[1]

Hence, the title and theme of this paper. As with any well-established role, the dean of education can be analyzed only within the context of reference groups that reflect what deans were, are, could be -- or would be. In keeping with the analogy, those reflections will be sharp, distorted, fuzzy and/or Platonic -- often all at the same time.

To the looking-glass self we must add George Herbert Mead's concept of the generalized other. Mead's work is critical to role theory, i.e., an individual's role can only be understood as one understands the roles and expectations of all the other individuals -- or "generalized other" -- with whom the individual interacts. Using the game of baseball as an analogy, Mead wrote:

> ...in a game where a number of individuals are involved, then the child taking one role must be ready to take the role of everyone else. If he gets in a ball nine he must have the responses for each position involved in his own position. He must know what everyone else is going to do in order to carry out his own play. He has to take all of these roles. They do not all have to be present in consciousness at the same time, but at some moments he has to have three or four individuals present in his own attitude, such as the one who is going to throw the ball, the one who is going to catch it, and so on. These responses must be, in some degree, present in his own make-up. In the game, then, there is a set of responses of such others so organized that the attitude of one calls out the appropriate attitudes of the other ....The child reacts to a certain stimulus, and the reaction is in himself that is called out in others, but

> he is not a whole self. In his game he has to have an organization of these roles; otherwise he cannot play the game. The game represents the passage in the life of the child from taking the role of others in play to the organized part that is essential to self-consciousness in the full sense of the term.[2]

We need only to substitute the word "dean" for the word "child" to make the shift in our analysis. Both of these concepts -- the looking-glass self and the generalized other -- are vital to the symbolic interactionist view of behavior. It is from that viewpoint that this analysis is derived.[3] The ideas discussed are applicable to any role in academe or any other institution. The focus on deans is merely in keeping with my own interests and experiences.

Let me cite several sources that have contributed to my understanding of the roles of professors and administrators, as well as of the workings of institutions of higher education. Because of my interest in the reform of education, I will offer suggestions that go beyond the data. Putting it most simply, my personal involvement in a deanship requires that research must have meaning and application beyond the analyses themselves. As I learn more about the professoriate and the decanal role, that knowledge is reflected in my behavior -- or at least that is my version of what I see in the looking-glass.

Recent Scholarship

Members of the Society will recall the 1975 papers on The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions.[4] Those papers stimulated my thinking about the role I had recently assumed. The papers offer revealing insights into the professoriate, including our historical roots, our relation to the broader professoriate, our internal divisions and sexism within our ranks. Since most of the papers are historical/descriptive analyses without firm data bases, much like the present paper, The Professor of Education is hardly the last word. Nonetheless, it is an encouraging word. It suggests a degree of maturity amongst us in the profession, for maturity is requisite to critical self-scrutiny. The 1975 monograph represents one of the few occasions where professors of education have taken a hard look at their profession. I am of the view that professionals ought to know all there is to know about the roots, trends and issues of their profession. Yet, I have been disappointed that most teacher educators are reluctant to analyze their own condition -- which does not make us any different from other professional groups. The 1975 papers, therefore, are a significant contribution.

A number of other scholarly efforts have paralleled the interests of the Society. In a small sense, we may be experiencing the phenomenon of "simultaneous inventions" that often characterize significant intellectual developments. In the spring of 1975, Neal Gross presented a paper to the Land Grant Deans of Education in Chicago.[5] Professor Gross had completed five years in the deanship at Pennsylvania and offered his review of that experience, offering suggestions for how deans can deal with all of the conflicting expectations put upon them. Gross and his associates had earlier postulated the concept of role consensus in perhaps the major theoretical analysis of the school superintendency, and that concept permeates this discussion.[6]

At the 1976 AERA Convention, Dean Ted Cyphert and Ms. Nancy Zimpher of The Ohio University presented a paper titled "The Educational Deanship: Who Is The Dean?" Based on a questionnaire survey of a 20% sample of deans and other directors of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education, this phase of their research provides demographic data regarding deans of education: their age, race, sex, geographic background, parental education, personal beliefs, career patterns, and related variables. A second phase will include variables such as perceived satisfaction with one's position, reasons for leaving the deanship and characteristics of the pool from which future deans are drawn. They summarize their initial findings as follows:

> Personally, American deans of education today are most commonly healthy and energetic, middle-aged, married, male, white, Protestant, Democrat academics from a relatively non-college educated, lower middle-class, non-professional-managerial, native-born, small-town, multi-child family background.
>
> Professionally, American deans of education today normally hold the doctorate degree, have had some training in educational administration, entered the profession through public school experiences, advanced from there to the University faculty, and took the deanship directly from a position in higher education. Despite their administrative duties, they manage to engage in as much research and writing as do their professorial colleagues, find however that the deanship does constrain both their personal and professional activities, belong to several national and regional professional associations, acknowledge the need for professional self-improvement, but engage in relatively little of it.[7]

This revealing study provides base-line data for further analyses of the deanship. Together with the hypotheses implicit and explicit in The Professor of Education, researchers need not begin from

scratch.

The paper by Ted Cyphert and Nancy Zimpher is itself a part of a broader inquiry. Under the leadership of the University Council for Educational Administration, a conference was held in early 1975 designed to produce a publication on the deanship in schools of education. A number of scholars are involved in this effort and a collection of papers on the "Deanship in Colleges of Education" edited by Dean Daniel Griffiths and Professor Donald McCarty is promised for 1977 publication.[8] I look forward to this document.

The research being completed by David Clark and Egon Guba at Indiana provides incisive insights into 1350 some Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education in the nation.* While only portions of that data have been reported, (including a presentation before this Society), it is clear that we can never again assume that SCDEs are uniform or comprise a national monolith.[9] They range from exceptionally large and complex university structures to one or two person departments. In point of fact, deans of education are debating if it is reasonable for NCATE Standards to be equally applicable to such a diverse range of institutions and programs -- and that is a concern permeating formal and cloakroom meetings at this convention. Of import here is the fact that the Clark-Guba studies of knowledge production and utilization in SCDE's provide a mine of information which must be carefully studied. Some of the data may confirm our worst fears regarding our lack of strong scholarly roots. On the other hand, the complexities of our profession will also emerge and much of our strength is implicit in that complexity. We have institutions and colleagues of whom we can be justly proud; we have emerging institutions with great potential; and we have pedestrian efforts that perpetuate our weakest attributes. Despite the diversity in our ranks, we may find some unique strengths.

These several scholarly contributions have influenced my thinking about the deanal role, and I commend our colleagues for their leadership in this work. My own work as a dean is also a partial source of data. In no sense do I pretend to present data systematically gathered as a participant-observer. I am convinced, however, that the methodology of participant observation is critical to understanding any role, and I will return to the need for ethnographic research. Suffice to say that the role of participant-

*I will henceforth use the acronym utilized by David Clark and Egon Guba for Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education, i.e., SCDE.

observer is well-established in anthropological analysis; it is the role many of us partially assume when we step-back to recover some sense of perspective on the activities of which we are a part. I have already suggested my bias in seeking this knowledge. I do not believe that knowledge is an end in itself. Knowledge is sought so that it can be applied to the solution of problems, and education has its share. Any insight I can gain into the professoriate, the deanship, higher education or the profession as a whole, will be applied in my work. If I did not have that as a goal, I would not be speaking to you at this time.

The Looking-Glass Dean

Given these introductory remarks, we turn to an analysis of the decanal role as a reflection of the expectations of others. The central thesis is that deans of education reflect the expectations of the professoriate from which they came and with whom they interact. Putting it facetiously, faculties have the kinds of deans they deserve or want. The remark is only partially facetious. A dean's performance is mainly determined by what is expected or permitted by colleagues. The looking-glass reflections or generalized others to which a dean responds include the professoriate, central administration, teacher's associations, cohorts of other deans, associations such as AACTE, and many others that determine the dean's performance. The dean's prior experiences and training comprise intervening variables which interpret or distort the images to which the dean responds. For example, how long was the dean a part of the professoriate and to what degree does the dean accept the ethic and behaviors of the professoriate? To what degree has the dean had public school experience which, I hypothesize, greatly influences that person's performance in higher education. These are only a few of a complex of internalized variables contributing to myopic or "steely-eyed" perceptions of looking-glass others.

It is central to role theory that all of the significant others that impinge on a given role be analyzed. It is only by identifying all of the images in the looking-glass that one has fulfilled Mead's concept of the generalized other. Having identified those significant others, it is possible to specify their expectations of the role incumbent. As Gross and others have explained, consensus on role definition by the role incumbent and all of the significant others determines success or failure in the role.

Let me note at this point the influence of an individual's psyche or personality on the role of dean. It is my contention that individualistic variables are of far less importance than are all of the expectations laid on the incumbent. In stating this I

lift the scab of half-truths and mythologies related to our understanding of personality in society. We can easily become embroiled in issues such as individualism and freedom within a social context, and even begin to resurrect dichotomies such as mind and body and nature versus nurture. These latter concepts have clouded our intellectual development for centuries and still are very much with us. I will only state my central assumption that deans of education have far more in common than they do differences. Some of these differences are, of course, due to personality traits, emotional and health conditions, energy levels, and other personal characteristics.

I also accept the concept of charismatic leadership, though there are few examples in our profession. Dwight Allen during his brief reign is perhaps the single best illustration. I would even venture to enter the concept of luck -- or statistical probabilities if you prefer -- as an intervening variable. That is, a dean with strong leadership traits may make decisions that work well and others that "bomb" in the same social setting. That dean's personality, goals, and determination to be a leader are constants, but the social context within which he/she operates is complex and factors such as "timing" or "luck" may be the key to any given success or defeat. While we must acknowledge that personalistic differences are a part of any dean's effectiveness, those characteristics are influenced by subtle changes in institutions and by all of the significant others with whom we interact.

Seymour Sarason's work is a major contribution to this point of view. He writes: "...one should be somewhat cautious about assigning blame for failure of educational change to the intellectual and personality characteristics of individuals. If only the problem were understandable in such simple terms!"[10] He analyzes factors reinforcing the overwhelming acceptance of personality as a major causal explanation. One of these factors

> ...is the unquestioned assumption that the response of the school person is understandable only or primarily in terms of <u>that</u> individual's personality -- the pejorative adjectives reflect an individual psychology. It rarely occurs to the outsider that the response of the school person reflects in some measure the fact that he is in a role that is characterized by duties and responsibilities and is defined by a complicated set of personal and professional relationships with many other people in the setting. The school principal, for example, no less than the outsider, is part of a social-professional structure that places constraints upon him independent of his personality. In short, the outsider responds as if his own knowledge about himself and his role in his own complicated setting have no bearing on how he understands and approaches the school.[11]

Whatever the educational role being discussed, one's personality is perhaps the single most applied explanation for how clientele are treated by role incumbents. Yet Sarason's work and a growing body of sociological/anthropological studies of education emphatically demonstrate the opposite to be true. Personality is a variable, but hardly the deus ex machina.

Symbolic interactionism and role theory in no sense defines us as robots in institutional settings. Such a conclusion is completely erroneous. Sociological, anthropological and psychological research supports the hypothesis that degrees of freedom exist within roles. These degrees of freedom provide an opportunity for some deans to exhibit what Oliver Wendell Holmes called "fire in the belly," as contrasted with counterparts who personify the "company man" or institutional drudge. Certainly, personalities and personal goals are stamped on the roles we occupy. While we have generalized definitions of wife or husband, for instance, we privately acknowledge a range of highly personalistic factors influencing our "fit" within these roles.

There is an overwhelming tendency, however, in our society and in education to place an exceptionally heavy emphasis on personalistic influences. We truly expect a Jimmy Carter to transcend all of the looking-glass images built into the Presidency. I emotionally share in hopes for Carter's influence, but any objective analysis must conclude that the Presidency is a highly circumscribed role. What Carter accomplishes will be the result of what is acceptable within his role rather than on what he as an individual brings to the role. Reflecting our pervasive cultural belief in competition as a part of "human nature," the emphasis on the individual as being responsible for his/her lot transcends all of our institutions, from the church, to the school, to welfare programs. In virtually all our interactions, a high premium is placed on individual accomplishments. As members of the SPE, for example, we need little reminder of whether educational psychology or social foundations departments dominate SCDE's -- at least in respect to numbers. The emphasis on "psychologizing" the process of education, a terrible term, is all too apparent. And the emphasis on psychological analysis is a result of our cultural heritage emphasizing personalistic explanations of behavior. In this same vein, the acceptance of Freudian explanations of behavior throughout our society hardly needs further amplification.

This paper cannot resolve the intracacies of the relationships between the individual and society. I am merely emphasizing the premise that we are all far more alike than different in any given role. If that were not the case, role theory would have no explanatory powers. Indeed, the major premises of sociological-anthropological research would be fallacious. I do not find any reason to come to that conclusion -- other than the academic penchant to

wish to see colleagues in other disciplines "go under" since only our discipline has the truth!*

Becoming A Dean

Let us sketch the process of becoming a dean and the significant others to whom the dean must respond in the looking-glass. Most of the list will be familiar: the faculty; to a much lesser extent the student body; members of central administration, whether they be called Provost, Vice President or President; particular school systems; associations of superintendents; key individuals in the state department of education; and so on. These reference groups easily come to mind and many others should be noted. Of major import, I would argue, are the ideals of the profession, a very shadowy generalized other. Professional ideals are vague and illusive images against which the dean measures himself/herslef. To some degree these ideals are reflected in national associations such as AACTE, NCATE or learned societies. But even this definition is inadequate since it does not take into account an individual's internalization of these ideans, as has already been suggested.

A given dean's upbringing, education, religious beliefs and political values impinge on the internalization of professional ideals. Some deans can be quite objectively defined as essentially "company employees." Among such deans it is unlikely that the ideals of the broader profession have much meaning. Their rewards are in the status and security of what may be charitably called a "low-profile" style of administration. I use the term "company employees" in the same context as unionists refer to company unions. The sociological term more appropriate would be that of the organizational man, i.e., the individual who rises to prominence within an institution by taking on the values and behaviors appropriate to that institution -- which includes every one of us.

Some deans will argue that they do not view themselves as organizational persons. Rather, they believe they achieved their deanship because of hard work, perserverance, the acknowledgement of peers, leadership activities, or a host of other positive attributes. But these convictions are tempered by the fact that any one promoted to a leadership role has met explicit and implicit expectations of the profession. Meeting those expectations means that

---

* If I continue in this direction, I will need to address the ethnocentrism and barriers to knowledge found in higher education, wherein inter-disciplinary cooperation is more an aberration than the rule.

the person is "safe." No one rises to leadership unless incumbents in the institution acknowledge that the person accorded increased power and status will help preserve and protect the institution.

It is critical that we note this latter expectation. It puts in perspective much of the rhetoric associated with the decanal role and anticipated changes within institutions. New deans, departmental chairs, provosts and presidents are frequently charged to alter practices within the organization they are to lead. There is often at least a superficial consensus that the new leader will be able to alter, adjudicate, influence or in some way change practices within the institution. As Clark and Guba put it: "New Deans or Chairpersons and new missions go together."[12] Institutional roles have sharp parameters within which leadership can be exerted and the new dean works within clear limits. Changes must be of such type and degree as not to challenge both public and hidden goals of the institution. The appropriate analogy here is the frame of the mirror in which expectations are reflected. The wooden or metal frame can be altered only at the price of shattering the mirror. Hence, the new messiah must offer changes that do not seriously threaten the core values of the institution.

The jazz expression "paying one's dues" explains this phenomenom and the constraints on leadership. Persons promoted to leadership roles have inevitably paid their dues to the institution or profession in which they are rising. They have internalized the patterns of behavior and social ethics appropriate to their calling. Bringing in a new leader to create change is realistic, but that expectation must be tempered with the understanding that that leader will be far more like others in the institution than he/she is different. In the public schools it is a cause celebre if an individual outside of education is named to a superintendency. In academe, any number of university presidents have been recruited from the ranks of business, the military, or government. Whenever such individuals are given educational leadership roles, much concern is voiced by educators. That concern is precisely the point being made. If the leader is promoted from within the ranks, we assume that he/she will behave within norms of the institution with which we are familiar, within which we play corollary roles, and within which we have a vested interest. An outsider, however, may make decisions outside our ken. It is no wonder that few outsiders are recruited to the deanship in education. But it is equally clear that few outsiders are recruited to lead medical schools, businesses, or armies. "Paying one's dues" within a given career is the accepted way of working one's way tc leadership. How long one pays those dues or how heavy the payments are another set of variables which make intriguing the work of search committees. Given this path to leadership, the dean's interactions with significant others can be better understood.

Interactions with Professors

The major referent group of the dean is the professoriate. No matter how many ancillary roles and bureaucratic functions ascribed to the role, the core of the decanal role is the interlocking set of expectations between a faculty and a dean. We are all familiar with the general distrust of administration extant within the professoriate. I value the autonomy of the professoriate -- though that autonomy is often more an ideal than a reality. But to the degree that some autonomy exists, I recognize that some of my administrative actions will be filtered through an atmosphere of distrust on the part of some colleagues. I wish this were otherwise, but some distrust is endemic and any dean will soon identify the vital signs of that fact. But the degree of distrust varies greatly from institution to institution, dean to dean, and faculty to faculty. Oddly enough, the longer I remain in a deanship the more comfortable I am with some degree of distrust. Abuses of power at any level of governance have roots far deeper than Watergate and skepticism regarding any leader is desirable. Equally important, sharp contrasts in responsibilities are vested in the deans office and these foster distrust. The dean may serve as an initiator, a facilitator, a mediator or a gatekeeper -- all during the same day! The dean is also expected to be an advocate for the faculty, yet the role demands the allocation of varied rewards and sanctions.

A serious question is the degree to which the dean is accountable to the professoriate? Does the dean believe that the professoriate should be "told", or that the dean should represent the consensus of the faculty? Based both on my understanding of role theory, my personal experience and value system, I see no choice in the matter: seeking consensus is the process, the goal, and at times the frustration of leadership. The parallel here is to the balance of powers that is the ideal of our governmental structure. The executive is free to propose ideas but the legislature must determine the wisdom of those ideas and the degree to which they are implemented. Once the legislature had acted, the executive is charged with enforcing the will of that body. Substituting the words "dean" and "faculty" in the analogy makes my point. As in government, there will be times when the faculty may feel the dean is overstepping his/her bounds. There will be other points at which the dean will be frustrated by the unwillingness of the faculty to accept proposals. There may be discomfirture that the dean is no longer reporting regularly to the faculty. The dean may feel the faculty is plotting a revolt. I need go no further to stress the balance that exists between the leadership potential of the decanal role and faculty perrogatives in respect to controlling programs, curricula, and other policies. How effectively any dean operates in this milieu can only be understood in the context of that milieu.

Interaction with Students

Unless the SCDE is quite small, it is unlikely the dean will have much interaction with students. There will be ritualistic interactions at commencements, award ceremonies, convocations, or similar events. There will be meetings with individual students to adjudicate problems. In the work-a-day world, however, it is unlikely that students are a major referent group. In point of fact, one of the embarrassing questions before all of us in higher education is the degree to which students are a significant reference group to many of us. In raising this question I do not demean the sincere commitment of many professors and administrators to the welfare of students. Indeed, the rhetoric of the profession is that all of our practices are in the best interests of the student body. Yet, an objective analysis of issues in the bureaucratic structure of universities must conclude that many issues have far more to do with working conditions and turf skirmishes affecting faculty far more than students. Some deans, hence, are likely to be concerned at second or third hand with student concerns, depending on colleagues for an interpretation of those concerns.

This does not mean that a dean cannot find ways of working directly with students. Advisory committees can be formed, students can be invited to meet for feedback sessions, and a host of other approaches are available. The dean may teach an occasional class and thus work with a sub-set of students in the SCDE. But the primary demands on the dean's office are not related to students. Much of the dean's time is devoted to faculty, personnel, governance and budgetary issues from which students are generally excluded.

In this regard, I am indebted to a former colleague, Richard Davis, for teaching me an important axiom. Namely, the dean's role is the last administrative role in academe where the work of administration and the work of the professoriate can be blended. Roles in central administration tend to divorce the administrator from students -- and even the professoriate. A dean who wishes to interact with students can do so -- the role permits some interaction despite many contrary pressures. For my part, if I lose that contact I will leave the deanship.

It should also be noted that there will be some amongst the professoriate who view a dean who gets too close to students as someone to be questioned. Students may provide views or concerns threatening to some of the professoriate; some skeletons may be unearthed. Willard Waller's insightful comments on the gulf between teachers and students -- between the young and the old -- apply to higher education as well as common schools.[13] It is often an artificial gulf, certainly at the college level. But the social distancing that characterizes most teaching-student relations is a significant cultural trait known to all of us. Deans all too frequently are not

viable participants in this set of interactions, though they have opportunities to bridge the gulf. The assumption here is that most professors and students want the chasm bridged, and that assumption may not stand an empirical test -- such is the power of traditional expectations.

Interactions with Other Deans

Each dean has a new peer group upon assuming the new role, i.e., other deans. Each dean on campus is compared formally and informally with every other dean. In this situation, some awareness of contextual differences between colleges on the same campus is vital. The expectations and traditions of each unit on a campus greatly influence each dean's performance. Frequently, all that is being compared amongst deans are personality traits and other public behaviors. These comparisons are often based on gossip and it is difficult to verify the accuracy of the information being circulated. In any case, deans are very much aware of these comparisons. Each dean wishes to be favorably compared with peers, but does not want to be too far out-of-step with the performance of those peers. The decanal referent group has its own norms of acceptable deanly behavior and each new dean learns these unspoken expectations.

This process is tempered by some expectations for competition to exist between colleges. Each dean is expected to do well for his/her unit and this fact implies doing better than the dean of another unit. Some central administrations will encourage competetiveness, though usually behind a veneer of rhetoric regarding team work. Whatever the rhetoric, deans will comprise a small group on any campus and there will be a tendency for them to support one another. Some sense of being separate from the faculty is a normal part of the dean's role and the political aspects of administration occupy an increasing amount of time. Because other deans are in exactly the same position, they provide a key reference group and influence new deans in particular.

Interactions with Central Administration

The term Central Administration includes all administrative ranks above that of dean, including presidents, chancellors, vice-presidents, provosts, and similar roles. Whatever the administrative style on a campus and the degree to which informal channels transmit "messages" up and down the bureaucratic maze, the dean must meet the expectations of a very generalized other within central administration. It is one of the most difficult of the generalized others to reflect accurately in the mirror of social interaction.

Central administration is by definition a bureaucratic, political, and fiscal organism, all vital parts of complex organizations. While all of these ingredients exist at any level in a SCDE, they are brought to high polish in central administration. In some institutions, the dean is an integral part of central administration, or even of the inner-circle within central administrations. On other campuses, the dean is tangential and is viewed as a "foreman" rather than as an executive, though this comment is more accurate when applied to departmental chairs. The dean will learn which definition is applicable early in his/her appointment. That definition will often vary with changes in central administration. A dean appointed by one administration may find the rules quite different when a new chief executive arrives on the scene.

The only point here is that the success or failure of a dean is measured against the performance of other deans as interpreted by a cluster of administrators in central administration. If one could assure that the expectations exhibited by the president of an institution are reinforced by the expectations of vice-presidents, provosts, registrars, and others, then this series of interactions would be relatively easy to navigate. This is seldom the case.

The dynamics of each central administration vary and the "fit" of any given dean in that labrynth makes for intriguing studies. My goal is to indicate that for most deans, central administration will be a new social system in which to work. Unless the "fit" between deans and central administration is one of mutual respect, the result may be that the new dean will remain just that -- a new dean, somewhere else!

Interactions with Local Educational Institutions

The local educational enterprise will include several school systems with which the SCDE works closely. It will also include a state department of education, professional associations and related groups. Whatever the local educational context, it is incumbent on deans to work closely with their colleagues in the public schools. An intervening variable is the relatively high degree of distrust some public school personnel exhibit toward professors and deans, the so-called ivory tower chasm. That chasm exists and I will not belabor the overwhelming need for teacher education to become far more field based and committed to public education. The means by which university-public school relations have been accomplished is almost always a patchwork design. New teacher centers legislation is but one evidence of efforts to alter that patchwork.

A new intervening variable in town-gown relationships is the power of teacher associations. Some deans fear the challenge to teacher educators enunciated by some teacher associations. There is now open discussion regarding the future of SCDE's, at least from segments of the NEA. The times are "a-changin" and this paragraph only underscores that interactions with public education including teacher associations are a vital part of the dean's role and image. Some of the image of a given SCDE is dependent on the willingness of the dean to work with public school colleagues. On this dimension, there are deans who score high and others who perpetuate a destructive separatism that demeans the entire profession.

Interactions with the Broader Profession

I have already alluded to the shadowy generalized other with which the dean interacts in the broader profession. I am speaking of the dean's vision of where the profession may be heading. A useful concept to determine this vision is offered by Alvin Gouldner in the well-known article on cosmopolitans and locals in the academy.[14] The "cosmopolitan" is one whose reference groups include national leaders and associations which influence the political and professional issues of the day. "Locals" will include deans who identify success or failure with programs related to the immediate community with very little contact with national trends. This concept is related to Philip Jackson's tripartate analysis of the professoriate into disciplinists, generalists and pedagogists.[15] I cite the cosmopolitans and locals dichotomy to underscore that the expectations of every faculty member, local school representative, and even students will also include the cosmopolitan/local dichotomy. There will be some who applaud a dean's knowledge as a threat to local conditions. Some locals wishing to become cosmopolitans will respond to a dean with that bent. There may even be cosmopolitans among the professoriate who would prefer the dean to be a local so that they do not have to share the limelight. It is an intriguing and useful concept in analyzing role behavior.

Interactions with One's Family

The personal dimension of the dean's role is usually completely ignored. The degree to which the role of dean interferes with or enhances familiar and other personal relationships is a delicate question. It is a subject carefully avoided because of its sensitivity. Yet, the dean is exposed to public scrutiny and that fact influences one's personal life. Nothing in my personal experience or anything I know about social/psychological dynamics suggest that a divorce between personal and professional roles is possible. Some

will argue that a dichotomy can exist, but I am convinced this view is far more rationalization than fact. In my view, the personal life and values of the dean are variables to be analyzed along with the professional performance of that individual. This is not an easily accepted view, but I will stick with my contention. Leadership and ego are one fabric, and that interaction should be carefully assessed -- other than at cocktail parties.

These several illustrations do not exhaust the list of generalized others with whom deans interact. The secretarial staff, alumni, graduate assistants, "soft-money" personnel, community groups, the press, personnel in extension units, buildings and ground personnel are still other significant others. If I have missed key groups, I will appreciate other insights.

Finally, every set of interactions between the dean and say, the professoriate, will range from some high to some low mark on a scale or continuum. Because of the emphasis in role theory on a consensus or balance of expectations, the concept of a scale provides a heuristic device for analyzing the performance of any dean with respect to sets of interactions, thus identifying the degree to which consensus is achieved. The concept of a continuum also underscores that situational analysis is central to this discussion. Each situation, each set of expectations, and the degree to which those expectations are shared or understood, are all variables on a continuum. The continuum concept also reveals the constantly shifting nature of all the variables. It is not a useful concept for those seeking certainty or closure on any role definition. Lewinian field theory also provides a useful tool as the valances of forces are computed and social/psychological barriers are strengthened or breached.

Conclusions

Let me end with two major conclusions: Leadership as the sine qua non of the decanal role, and the need for ethnographic analyses of that role.

Leadership in the Decanal Role

Given all of the expectations placed on the decanal role, the bottom line of the maze is the concept of leadership. As a student of the dean's role, I am convinced that deans have a critical role to play if education is to extricate itself from the morass of which it is a part. The decanal role is only one point of entry into the broader topic and I do not mean to ignore the professoriate or any other segment of the profession. Inherent in the decanal

role, however, is some expectation of leadership and that aspect of the role needs to be both demanded and encouraged.

If the deanship is viewed as an honorific position or a sinecure, little can be expected. If it is defined as a "middle management" assignment, an implicit expectation has been laid for the inevitable passing of the buck that is a norm in mid-management. In truth, the dean is a person in the middle -- attempting to lead a faculty while at the same time representing the best interests of that faculty in the political/fiscal workings of central administration. Emphasizing the role of the dean as being in the middle is but another way of underscoring the differences in expectations to be met.

I am convinced that additional scholarship will verify what experience has taught me. The overwhelming expectation of the professoriate is that the dean will provide leadership of some type. How much leadership or in what directions is not the issue. It may be leadership that some will view as counter-productive or reactionary. Some ideas and proposals will be viewed as a threat to traditional values. But whatever our political/philosophical persuasion, we would agree that the person carrying the title of dean should exert leadership to some degree.

For this reason, the search and screening process for any dean must be absolutely explicit regarding the leadership qualities sought. The selection process is realistic only: (1) If the new dean has an established track record of leadership: (2) If issues facing the institution are clearly identified; and (3) If faculty and administrative commitments to resolving those issues are part of the position description. These conditions are sometimes met in search processes, albeit on an informal basis. Certainly, closed door discussions of candidates focus on leadership qualities and internal issues. My contention is that these matters should be public in every respect. Qualities of leadership must be an absolutely explicit part of the position description and should be thus advertised.

Leadership in public institutions is too important to gamble on individuals who have not been carefully screened on the leadership component. Again, some of this happens on an informal basis and occasionally on an explicit basis. It must happen in every case, in my judgment, though this means the hanging of some dirty linen. If leadership is not desired, however, then a faculty indeed deserves what it gets.

The length of time a dean serves in that role is another key issue to be addressed. The dean's position -- as with all administrative positions -- should be for a set time period. I had some convictions on this matter when I took my present position and re-

gret not negotiating a fixed appointment. (I should note I'm quite happy where I am!) Setting a fixed period of appointment makes it possible for regular reviews of performance and a person either continues in the role or withdraws -- perhaps with some grace.

I would go even further. Whenever a dean or departmental chair does not continue to exhibit the qualities of leadership expected by the faculty and central administration, then a recall movement is both a necessary and positive step. Our seeming willingness to permit persons to stay in leadership roles though all objective evidence of their performance is negative is difficult to comprehend. If we value our calling, we need to provide for changes in leadership regularly and/or when needed. There is not room for holders of sinecures in any democratic institution. If we truly care about our profession, we need to recall any leader who has lost his/her effectiveness or vision. The concept of accountability is implicit in this view and is central to my thesis. I have enough faith in my colleagues to believe that needed recalls can be achieved humanely. My convictions on these matters are predicated on the power of ethnographic research -- on studies that reveal the full dynamics of our work.

The Need for Ethnographic Analyses

My emphasis on role theory is intended to underscore the need for studies of our profession utilizing sociological/anthropological concepts. Demographic data gathered on SCDE's, deans and the professoriate are vital. These studies expand our knowledge and offer a host of hypotheses. To test these hypotheses, we need to conduct intense ethnographic studies. In such studies, our verbal and non-verbal behavior in all of the interactions related to our role are noted, sorted, analyzed and conceptualized. Ethnographic analysis includes everything we say, the perceptions of others about what we said, and how that information is relayed to still others. What we wear may be critical information, as is with whom we eat lunch? What professional associations do we attend? What do we say or do immediately after a person leaves our office? What values do we espouse and practice in every interaction? What can be learned from our body language? Depth interviews with all incumbents reflected in the looking-glass coupled with painstaking notes by participant-observers are a part of this process.

Let me cite an excellent introduction to this type of research. Harry Wolcott's <u>The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography</u> is in my view the best study of the principalship in American education. It is an ethnographic case study based on an N of one. In their introduction to the book, the Spindler's write: "...it is only through a case study in depth of this kind that the dynamics

of the system and the interactions of people within it can be seen in their functional totality."[16] Wolcott adds his own rationale:

> More recently I have been struck with the manner in which the rapidly expanding body of educational research shows a trend toward huge, costly studies which often yield strikingly unimportant data (for example, 97 percent of high school social studies teachers talk about politics in class "always," "often," or "sometimes;" or that "44 percent of the teachers in metropolitan areas are satisfied as compared to 35 percent of the teachers in small towns"). Human beings get lost in masses of figures which bury the very subjects of study. The surveys tell us too little about too many, and they tell us more about how the subjects acted during the filling out of a questionnaire than about how they act in their "real" life. So this study also grows out of a personal dissatisfaction and impatience with the present over-reliance on data which are quickly and easily obtained by which alone can never provide a complete picture of actual behavior in context regardless of how one increases his "n's" or lengthens his questionnaires.[17]

Again, this view does not denigrate survey research. Rather, it acknowledges what scholars generating survey research data know all too well. The dynamics of life within institutions call for research for deeper than survey research will ever accomplish.

Wolcott's work is a model of the candid exposition of procedures utilized in ethnographic study, including ethical and other considerations. Noting several of his chapter titles is instructive: "The Principal as a Person;" "What a Principal Does: Formal Encounters;" "What A Principal Does: Informal Encounters and Daily Routines;" "The Annual Cycle of the Principalship;" "Maintaining the System: The Principal as Socializer;" and "Behind Many Masks." Substituting "dean" or "professor" in the above titles makes the point. We read works by journalists such as Studs Terkel who reveal our society by vignettes of working people, or by Tom Wolfe who flamboyantly reveals the life-styles of certain sub-cultures. These are not ethnographic analyses, to be sure, but they reveal the sinew of the persons or sub-cultures analyzed.

Wolcott achieves a far deeper view by utilizing a rigorous methodology, an approach far more demanding than much of the experimental research dominating AERA and similar associations. We will understand the dean of professor of education only when we analyze every nuance of that role, a process requiring comprehensive case studies.[18] To paraphrase Wolcott, it is not the N that is critical: it is the depth and breadth of the analysis that is the issue. Recalling Clyde Kluckhohn's classic, are we ready to

look into the Mirror for Man?[19]

One final point will underscore my conviction that we must initiate ethnographic case studies. SCDE's have many virtues and strengths, but they share one common denominator. They seldom practice what they preach. Other than in experimental and pilot projects, the teaching/learning environments and practices of most SCDE's are hardly exemplary. They are similar to traditional university teaching/learning systems and as such fluctuate between 19th and early 20th century practices. At best, they are 20 years out of date.

Yet, SCDE's are supposedly the repositories of the best available knowledge on the teaching/learning process. As deans or professors, how do we live with this fact? For arguments sake, I am not even considering that my assessment might be too severe. One of the major questions before all of us is how we live with the gap between our ideals and practices? I believe we have the strength to address that issue. Ethnographic analysis of our respective roles in perpetuating or struggling to alter this condition is a ripe arena for research. That research just may help us to reform our programs and institutions for life in the 21st century, since that is where our clientele will live and practice their craft.

These final remarks go beyond our data base at this juncture. But scholarship that does not make some connection with the improvement of our profession is of no interest to me. In all of the cries for reform, it is clear that no reform can take place unless those charged with the training of educators are also reformed. Some of us will recall the grand vision of Triple T projects in this regard. Re-educating ourselves, however, is a conclusion few of us are willing to acknowledge; it disturbs our sense of comfort. Nonetheless, the caveats of reform are such that no meaningful alterations take place unless they influence all segments of the institution being changed. As professors and administrators in SCDE's, we are either part of the solutions or of problems. Being part of the solution is vital to our professional survival, and we can only be part of that solution if we more thoroughly understand our characteristics and potentials.

My emphasis on the dean as a composite of expectations can be interpreted as a pessimistic view. What can one do given all of the demanding images in the looking-glass? My answer is optimistic in all respects. Understanding every nuance of a role permits testing the limits of the role. Leaders or change agents, if you will, must be students of their roles if they have any hopes of influencing institutional change. That is my goal, and I hope you share my conviction in this regard.

NOTES

[1]C.H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order, Scribner, 1902, p. 184.

[2]G.H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society. University of Chicago Press, 1934, pp. 151-52.

[3]For a comprehensive introduction to symbolic interactionism, see Alfred R. Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss, Social Psychology (Revised Edition), Dryden Press, 1957.

[4]Ayers Bagley, Ed., The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions. University of Minnesota, Society of Professors of Education, 1975.

[5]Neal Gross, "Situationally Based Leadership - The Deanship." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1975.

[6]N. Gross, W.S. Mason, and A.W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. Wiley, 1958.

[7]Frederick R. Cyphert and Nancy Lusk Zimpher, "The Education Deanship: Who Is the Dean?" A paper presented at the 1976 Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, pp. 21-22.

[8]University Council for Educational Administration Review, vol. XVIII, No. 2, January 1977, pp. 30-31.

[9]David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, An Inventory of Contextual Factors and Conditions Affecting Individual and Institutional Behavior in Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education. Indiana University, Research On Institutions of Teacher Education, 1976.

[10]Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Allyn and Bacon, 1971, p. 10.

[11]Ibid., p. 11.

[12]Clark and Guba, op. cit., p. 16.

[13]Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching. Wiley, 1932.

[14]Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-I." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957, No. 2, pp. 281-306. Part II appears in the same journal, 1958, No. 2, pp. 444-80.

[15]Philip Jackson, "Divided We Stand: Observations on the Internal Organization of the Education Professoriate," in Ayers Bagley, op. cit., pp. 61-70. Cf. Clark and Guba, op. cit., pp. 14-15, with their comments on "stars," "drones" and "regulars."

[16]Harry F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973, p. viii.

[17]Ibid., p. xiv.

[18]For a detailed introduction to ethnographic research, see Harry F. Wolcott, "Criteria for an Ethnographic Approach to Research in Schools." Human Organization, Vol. 34, Summer 1975, 111-27.

[19]Clyde Kluckhohn, Mirror for Man. McGraw-Hill, 1949.